

137 A
LETTER

TO THE

Rev^d. Mr. ENTY,

IN

ANSWER to his slanderous Pamphlet,
intituled, *A Preservative against several Abuses
and Corruptions of Revel'd Religion, &c.*

BEING A

DEFENSE

OF SEVERAL

NOTES and DISCOURSES,

Contain'd in

A BOOK, intitled, *A free and impartial
Study of the Scriptures recommended.*

By JOSEPH HALLET, junior.

Them that sin rebuke before all. 1 Tim. v. 20.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. NOON, at the White Hart near Merchants-
Chapel, in Cheap-side. MDCCLXXX.

[Price Six-pence.]

LETTER

TO THE

Rev. Mr. F.W.T.

IN

ANSWER to his letter of the 11th inst.
concerning the proposed
and proposed of the 11th inst.

BEING A

DEFEAT



Notes and Discourses

Containing

A Book, entitled, 'A new and improved
system of the English language.'

By JOSEPH HALL, Esq.

From the original MS. in the Library of the
British Museum.

L O N D O N :

Printed by J. Noon, at the House of the
Commons, in Strand, near the
[illegible]



REVEREND SIR,

I Have neither leisure nor inclination to take particular notice of every passage in your *Preservative*; nor is the world much concern'd in the dispute you have rais'd. I shall therefore but briefly vindicate my self against the invidious charges which you have advanced against me, and detect some of your most notorious forgeries and mistakes. If you had said some few ill things of me, and misrepresented me in *measure*, possibly you would have tempted me to be angry. But really, Sir, you have over-shot your self, you have carried matters too far; and there is no danger, that any one, who has read my *Notes* and *Discourses*, should be capable of thinking me to be so very bad as you, with your *known* false charges, have endeavour'd to represent me. I assure you, I can easily despise the envy that runs through your whole performance. I will not retaliate; but you must excuse me, when I represent things as they are, and do not pay you the compliment of calling gross forgeries and falsifications by any wrong name.

You begin, in your preface, to represent me as a *pretended friend* to religion, as falling foul upon *natural and reveled religion*, as *preparing men for atheism*, and all ill *practices*, and the like. These are heavy charges. In another man, they would be looked upon as malicious; but orthodoxy covers a multitude of sins. My comfort is, all your airs will not make the world, nor even many of your own hearers, believe you.

As to what you say about my first Discourse, relating to the purity of the *Hebrew* text, I shall only observe, that one who does not understand the *Hebrew*, is no perfect judge of it; and that, God willing, I hope, next winter, to publish a distinct Discourse about it.

As to my Discourse about anger, you wretchedly puzzle your self, by not considering, that anger is different from grief. Though an inferior abused may grieve, complain, remonstrate, yet still it may be true, that he must not be angry with his superior. Anger is an inclination to punish. Thus is anger constantly defined. Mr. *Locke* calls it, *An uneasiness, or discomposure of the mind, upon the receipt of any injury, with a present purpose of revenge*, Essay, B. II. C. xx. § 12. *Curcellæus* defines it, *An affection of punishing, or of repaying evil to him that has injured us*, Ethic. p. 59. *Des Cartes* defines it, *A kind of hatred against those that have done us an injury, and a desire of revenge*, Ethic. p. 75, 76. Lond. 1685. *Philaretus* says, *Anger flows from an evil action that touches us, which we have a desire to revenge*, Ethic. p. 100. Amstel. 1696. Since then anger signifies a desire (not of appealing to the magistrate, that reason will do, but) of taking present revenge with our own hands, it is plain, that anger cannot be allowable in any, but superiors, who have a right to punish, and in them only when the inferior deserves the punishment they desire to inflict. If you take the word, *Anger*, in a sense, in which mankind does not understand it, your mistake herein has mislead your judgment about my Discourse. Our blessed Savior does not contradict this, when he forbids a man to be *angry with his brother without a cause*. For a *brother* does not here signify an equal in contra-distinction to superiors and inferiors, but *any man*, as is a common meaning of that word in the bible. And so Christ charges them, that have a right to be angry, when there is cause, not to be angry without a cause. And when St. *Paul* forbids parents to *provoke their children to wrath*, he supposes it would be a sin in the children to be angry; which confirms my observation, and so helps to shew, that my Discourse is not so poor as you represent it.

A learned and worthy friend has observed to me, that *Lactantius* has the same thought about anger, viz. that it is allowable only in *superiors*, as appears from his own words. Anger is given us, says he, by God, to correct

rest the faults of them that are under our power ; that, as it is just and necessary to be angry with *inferiors*, so it is impious and inhuman, as well as dangerous, to be angry with our *equals* *.

What you say on my first Note, is directly false in fact. You say, *It seems to be little more than a translation of what Mr. Pool says*, in his Synopsis, on 2 Kings xxiv. 13. I will transcribe both, that the reader may judge. The text is, — *And cut in pieces all the vessels of gold.* The Note, in the Synopsis, is, “ Rather, *he took away* ; “ in Hebrew, *he maim’d*, i. e. by taking away those vessels he, as it were, *maim’d the temple*, by robbing it of “ its wealth ; for that those vessels were preserved intire, “ is plain, from *Dan. v. 2.*” My own Note is in these words, *viz.* “ This rendering is wrong. It should be, “ *cut down, or cut off, viz. from their bases, &c.* to “ which the vessels were fasten’d. So the word פֶּסַח is “ used in this very book, *Chap. xvi. 17.* And king Ahaz “ *cut off the borders of the bases, and removed the laver “ from off them, &c.* and *Chap. xviii. 16.* And this rendering agrees with *Dan. v. 2, 3.* where we read, that “ these vessels of gold were still in being, and fit to be “ used as drinking vessels.” Now, I hope, you see that the one Note was not borrowed from the other ; for they have nothing in common between them, but citing *Dan. v. 2.* Mr. Pool’s author applies the word to the temple, I to the vessels, and mention’d parallel places, of which he took no notice. After such a falshood, the reader will less wonder at others he will meet with in your book.

My second Note was on the *English* translation of *Ezra*, viii. 35. “ Also the children of those that had been carried away, which were come out of the captivity, offer’d

* Nobis datus est iræ affectus ad coercenda peccata eorum, qui sunt in nostra potestate, ut arctiore disciplina minor ætas ad probitatem, justitiamque formetur. — Itaque ut ira uti adversum minores, & justum est & necessarium ; sic & adversum pares, & perniciosum est & impium. Impium quod violatur humanitas ; perniciosum, quod illis repugnantibus aut perdere necesse est, aut perire. *Lassant. de vero cultu, Lib. VI. cap. 19.*

Ira ad coercionem peccatorum, id est, ad regendam subjectionem disciplinam data est a Deo ; ut metus licentiam comprimat ; & compescat audaciam ; & qui terminos ejus ignorat, irascitur paribus, aut etiam fortioribus. *Epist. cap. 4.*

“ burnt-

"burnt-offerings." Upon this I observed, that they, who are here called *the children of those that had been carried away*, were really the very persons that were carried captives, call'd here, in *Hebrew*, *Children of the captivity*. You have taken upon you to say, this Note is *very useless*, for this profound and unintelligible reason, because, "If we read the whole *Verse*, we cannot well be at any loss to understand who those children were; for they are spoken of as *Representatives* of all that were carried away captive." This is a curious specimen of your manner of reasoning.

My third Note was on *Psal.* li. 14, 16, 19, in which I shew'd, that those *Verses* could not be understood of *David's* own time. You have not answer'd one thing I urged. As to what you say about the restoration of sacrifices, I reply, that you cannot understand the last *Chapters* of *Ezekiel* without supposing it; and that there is no difficulty in supposing, that when the *Jews* shall be restored to their own land, they shall first restore their old worship, before they are converted to Christianity, and, when they are Christians, lay it aside.

Your argument at the end of your preface is very extraordinary; because Christ is called, *John* i. 9. the *true*, i. e. the chief, or most famous *Light*, compared with whom the light of the sun is but darkness; and, because *God is Light*, therefore you conclude that Christ is supreme God. You might as well have proved it of something else, which is also called *the true Light*, i. *John* ii. 8. Besides, it happens a little unluckily for you, that if your argument proves any thing, it proves that Christ is the very Person of the Father of Christ. For as St. *John*, i. *Epist.* i. 5. says, that *God is Light*, so he expressly tells us, *Ver.* 7. that *Jesus Christ* is *his Son*, i. e. the Son of that God, who is Light. And now I leave you to make the best of it.

You begin your furious book with abundance of ribaldry and scolding, which I heartily despise and laugh at. The first thing you take notice of is, what I said relating to bishop *Pearson's* laying a stress upon the use of the word *παντοδυναμις*, in the sixth article of the common creed. All that you have said, from archbishop *Usher*, I knew some months ago, by the kind assistance of some very excellent friends; upon which I determined to write a Discourse on this subject, in my second Volume of Notes and Dis-

Discourses, to which I refer you. In the mean time, I shall only say, that it must have been a defect of memory in bishop Pearson, to speak of *Greek copies* in the plural number, when archbishop Usher has but one that reads *πατοδωαυμ*, and it does not appear that there is another such in the world ; and that I beg leave to tell you a *riddle*, viz. that the Creed in *Benner Coll.* is not to be regarded, because the *Greek* translator blunder'd in rendering *Omnipotentis* by *πατοδωαυμ*, when he should have render'd it by *πατοκετορες*. The learned know what I mean ; and, God willing, I will explain the riddle for your use in my second Volume.

In my third Discourse, I proved that the Son of God knows the thoughts of men. This you do not deny. You enter into a discourse about an *instrumental* Creator ; upon the occasion of which I will only say, that I desire you not to make meanings for me ; but to take my sense on this head, in those excellent words of Dr. Waterland, that *the Father, as Supreme, issued out orders for the creation of the world, and the Son executed them.* You say, that Christ knows the Father's thoughts by immediate intuition, p. 11. To prove this, you urge Christ's words, *John x. 15. As the Father knoweth me, even so I know the Father.* The meaning of which text is plainly this, (not that each knows in the same manner, but) that as the Father knew Jesus to be what he really was, viz. the Son of God incarnate, so also Jesus knew the Father to be what he was, viz. his Father and his God. That this is the manner in which the text must be interpreted, is clear from the foregoing Verse, where Christ says, *I know my sheep, and am known of mine ;* for surely you will not say, that the sheep know Christ's thoughts by intuition, as Christ knows theirs. Our divine Savior himself has told us, how he knew the Father, *John vii. 29. I know him, viz. God ; for I am from him, and he hath sent me,* Matt. xi. 27. *All things are deliver'd unto me by my Father, — no one knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son will revele him.* These texts, surely, don't prove, that he, to whom all things are deliver'd, knew them without revelation, and that he, who was capable of being sent, knew as much as he that had authority to send him.

You well observe, p. 12. that God knows all things : But I desire you, when your temper is a little cool'd, to take

Take notice, that the texts you cite, on this head, speak of one single Person, as, *I, the Lord, search the heart; O Lord, thou triest the reins; Thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts.* These words, *I* and *Thou*, signify one Person only. For, as has been often observed, and was never answer'd, when ever we can be sure, that more Persons of the Trinity than one speak, they say, *We, Us, Our.* Gen. i. 26. *Let us make man in our image;* Isai. vi. 8. *Who will go for us?* John xiv. 23. *We will come to him, and make our abode with him;* John xvii. 21, 22. *That they also may be one in us; That they may be one, even as we are one.* See the *Unity of God not inconsistent*, &c. p. 9. From hence it follows, that your argument, in this place, if it proves any thing, will prove, that Christ is the Person of the Father. The question that is moved, is, Whether, besides knowing the hearts of men, he also knows the Father's thoughts by intuition? You take a very odd method to prove the affirmative, by citing many texts to shew, what is not disputed, that Christ knows the hearts of all men: But what is this to the question? Indeed, you add, p. 15. that the disciples ascribed an all-comprehensive knowledge to Christ, *Thou knowest all things*, John xvi. 30. You must pardon my presumption, in saying, that you did not deal fairly by the text, when you concealed the remaining words of it, *By this we believe, that thou camest forth from God.* Since the apostles did not argue, from their expression, that Christ is equal to God; I don't see how you can warrant the doing it. The apostles, and St. Peter in particular, only meant, that Christ knew all men, and all their hearts, and therefore what they said was not *fulsome and blasphemous applause*, to use your words, p. 17. but the truth, and so they needed not to be corrected. This full and perfect knowledge of all the creation, every one, besides you, sees to be perfectly sufficient, in point of knowledge, to qualify the Son of God to hear mens prayers, and to be their final Judge.

You next labour and sweat, p. 18—33. to answer those texts (as Dr. Wotton ^{you} more truly than you thought of, speaks, p. 15. which are not to be answer'd, but to be believed as God's word) wherein it is said, that *the Father only knew the day of judgment*, Matt. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32. In answer to these express texts, you say, that Christ did know the day as God, but did not know it as man.

man: And you add, that you *have sufficiently obviated all the objections of Crellius, Mr. Emlyn, and others upon this Head*, p. 33. Whether you have, or not, the reader will judge, when I have transcribed a passage from certain *Queries*, which were published and *presented at Exeter*, some years since, which, no doubt, you have seen. The passage is this: "If he knew it, either as God, or man, he *must* know it, and therefore could not consistently with truth say, he did *not* know it. A wide difference is to be made between asserting and denying a thing to belong to his Person. If I assert any thing to belong to his Person, my assertion is true, if it belong to either nature; as, I may say, Christ was before *Abraham*, because this is true with respect to his divine nature. But if I should *deny* that Christ was before *Abraham*, I should be understood to deny, that either nature was before *Abraham*, and should speak what is false. And, according to this way of equivocating, a man, as one (*i. e.* Mr. *Emlyn*, whose objections you pretend to have sufficiently obviated, tho' you have not said one word about what he here) observes, may deny that he saw a thing, which he actually saw, meaning, he did not see it with one eye; which he will fully kept shut, while he beheld it with the other." Till you shall have answer'd this objection, it is too soon to triumph.

In this part of your Discourse, you have brought in, by the bye, some other texts, relating to other matters, about which I shall not now treat, but only refer you to books that have treated of them. What you say upon *Jude*, Ver. 4. was, long since, answer'd by Mr. *Peirce*, in his Reply to your *Truth and Liberty consistent*, p. 66; 67. to which you have not yet said one word. In the same pamphlet, he also answer'd all you have said, on 2 *Pet.* ii. 1. to which you have given no reply. Till you shall answer what he has said, I shall take no notice of your urging old arguments, that have been thoroughly baffled. Your sense of 1 *John* v. 10. is over-turn'd, *in this Letter*, p. 35.

You next proceed to my seventh Discourse, concerning the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, in St. *Matthew*. By your tedious harangue, p. 35. one would think you would have me suppress truth, when I knew it, as if truth were capable of doing mischief. As 'tis fact, that the transcribers of the New Testament have been sometimes

guilty of mistakes, I know no end it can serve, but that of priestcraft, to conceal it from the people.

Whatever you suggest, in your usual complaisant way, I had no view in quoting the *Philopatris*, but merely as far as was necessary to maintain my argument.

You blame me for saying, that the doxology in *Matthew* is a plain, rational doxology, as if this imported, that there is reason to ridicule the common doxology that Christians use, p. 37. which, you own, is *not found in scripture in so many words*. As then you profess to dissent from the church of *England*, because it requires unscriptural terms of communion, permit me to ask you, How you can, upon this principle, vindicate your self in the use of an unscriptural doxology? Did not the inspired apostles best know what kind of doxology was most suited to the doctrine of Christ, and most agreeable to the will of God? If they had approved the common doxology, is it not strange, that they should, among above twenty, never give us one doxology of any other kind, than to the Father, to the Son, to the Father and Son, and to the Father through the Son? And is it not very odd, that you, and your zealous friends, should industriously avoid every scripture-form of doxology? Why should they be always avoided, as if they were not orthodox enough?

You come, p. 38, &c. to speak of the MSS. of St. *Matthew's* gospel. I had said, that two of the three oldest omitted the doxology, which you do not deny; upon the account of their being the oldest, I thought them the best, or fittest to decide the dispute, whether the doxology is as old as the prayer. Those that were written in the IXth and following Centuries, seem, to me, not so well adapted to decide it. And how much soever you sometimes boast of those modern MSS. which have the doxology, you your self give them up, p. 57. where you say, "That *Stephens's* second is of so late a date, that it must be of very little weight in this controversy;" and yet this was written in the XIth Century, while no more than one of those you depend upon, is older than the Xth; and so, by your own confession, they are too late to be of any weight in this controversy. If this be truth, when for you, 'tis truth, when against you. As to the ancient copy in the *Cambridge* library, I own'd, it abounds with interpolations; upon which account, I thought its testimony against an interpolation was considerable. The truth is this: If all other

other MSS. all the versions, and all the fathers, had retain'd the doxology, I should have thought the single testimony of this MS. would have been of no weight: But when this MS. of *venerable antiquity*, as *Beza*, in the Letter you cite, calls it, agrees (as one would expect the oldest manuscripts should do) with the oldest versions and fathers, we cannot but, after the example of *Beza*, in that same letter, conclude that it is to be regarded. Let both the *Cambridge* and the *Vatican* copies be written by *Latin* scribes, and conformed to the old *Latin* version, as much as they will; they will then be valuable as *Latin* copies, which are a great deal older than any *Greek* ones, that have the doxology, except one; and their antiquity will give them a preference, considering, that, in this omission, they agree with the oldest versions and fathers too.

You have, to speak modestly, for you have forbidden me to be vain, express'd your self inaccurately and loosely, when you say, p. 41. "It is most probable that the doxology was expunged out of both by the *Latin* scribes, that had the handling of them." This looks as if you thought the doxology was first written in these copies, and was afterwards blotted out; whereas, in truth, it was never there. Though you seem to grant that the *Cambridge* MS. is one of the oldest, p. 40. and have not denied that the *Vatican* MS. is so too, when you were speaking particularly of it; yet afterwards you roundly say, that the doxology is in the most ancient *Greek* MSS. p. 41, 42. This looks odd. Neither I, nor you, can say any thing about those MSS. besides what *Simon*, *Luke of Bruges*, *Mill*, &c. say of them. They have seen the MSS. and they reckon those, which omit the doxology, to be two of the most ancient. You say, in most things, I follow Dr. *Mill*, *with a most implicate faith*, p. 40. This, Sir, is a very silly reflection; for I never yet quoted him for any thing, but for a fact, of which he was a witness, about MSS. and such things, as I had never seen.

I had observed, that the oldest *Greek* fathers omitted the doxology; such as *Origen*, *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Cyril of Jerusalem*. As to *Origen*, you, p. 43. unhappily betray your self, by declaring you need to be told, "Whether I had what I said out of his *Homilies*, as written in *Greek*, or out of the *Latin* translation that was made of his commentaries." I now tell you, what all

learned men, that have read my Discourse, know already, that I had it not out of *Origen's Homilies*, or *Commentaries*, either in *Greek* or *Latin*, but, as I there said, out of his *Commentary on the Lord's Prayer*, a distinct book, which is otherwise call'd, *Origen πει ευχης*, or *De Oratione*. Your suggestion, that *Origen* might use a *Nazarene* copy, when he writ his *Commentary on the Lord's Prayer*, is very impertinent; because, however he might happen to forget some part of a text in other places, 'tis extremely unlikely that he should forget the doxology, which, if it was as ancient as the gospel, he must certainly have often read, and heard repeated, and learn'd, when he learn'd the Lord's Prayer. See the *Inquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church*, Part II. p. 35—38.

I have not the *Vanity* to say, as you do, p. 44. that *if the doxology should be taken away, the form would be imperfect*, for fear this would look like a reflection upon *St. Luke*, in whose gospel there is no doxology added to the Lord's Prayer; yet surely the evangelist did not leave the Prayer imperfect; and there is praise in those words, *Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.*

Your arguing, p. 45. that because *David* did (not conclude a prayer with a doxology, but) *begin* a prayer with blessing God, and ascribing glory to him, 1 *Chron.* xxix. 10—19. therefore it is likely *Christ* would, *after this example, conclude* his prayer with a doxology, is very extraordinary. The custom, among Christians, of adding doxologies to prayers, arose from the practice of the apostles, who use them often in their epistles, as you observe, p. 46. So that this custom of the church is far from undeniably proving, that they owed their original to a doxology at the end of the Lord's prayer; nor can it be proved, that the apostles derived their custom of using doxologies in their epistles, from any doxology they ~~found~~ at the end of the Lord's Prayer; since, among above twenty in their epistles, that, which is now found in *St. Matthew*, is not once met with.

You say, p. 47. *Chrysostom followed copies that were more ancient than any that we now have*, which is granted. Upon this, you heedlessly ask, *How then could Mr. H——t venture to say, that the most ancient of the Greek MSS. knew nothing of the doxology?* If your resolution to oppose me, right or wrong, had not here blinded your

your eyes, you would have perceived, that when I called the *Cambridge* and the *Vatican MSS.* two of the oldest, I meant, that they are two of the oldest which are *now in being*. There can be no doubt, but that *Chrysostom* might have in his hands some that were older; but those are now no more. And it is as true that *Cyril* and *Gregory*, who lived just before him, might have copies as ancient as his; and that *Origen*, who lived almost two hundred years before him, might have much older copies than any he had. It was then very weak in you to oppose *Chrysostom's* copies to those that are now in being; unless, at the same time, you had observed, that the copies, used by the other *Greek* fathers, were to be opposed to his. And to the *Greek MS.* from which the *Gothic* version was made, I oppose that from which the *Saxon* was made, but especially that from which the old *Latin* version came; which version, the learned, and you your self elsewhere, allow, is of vastly greater use, in settling the true reading of the text of the New Testament, than you here fancy.

P. 52. You give us the doxology in *Polycarp's* prayer; but your translation of it unhappily shews, either that you do not understand the *plainest Greek*, or else, that you have wickedly mis-translated it, to serve a turn of orthodoxy. You render it, *Lord,—I will glorify thee thro'—Christ Jesus,—by whom to thee, with him, AND the Holy Ghost, be glory now, and for ever*; whereas in the *Greek*, even as you your self have quoted it, it is, *IN the Holy Ghost, εν πνευματι αγιω*. To satisfy the *English* reader of this, it is enough to observe, that the *Greek* expression is the very same as is render'd, *Praying IN the Holy Ghost*, *Jude*, ver. 20. which, I hope, you will not render, *Praying AND the Holy Ghost*.

You say, with an air of boasting, p. 54. *That the doxology could not be taken from any liturgies in the three first Centuries, because there were none*. What then? Might it not be taken from liturgies in the fourth Century? This doxology does not appear, in any MS. or writer, older than the end of the fourth Century. The oldest MS. now in being, that has it, is supposed, by them that have seen it, to be no older than the *fifth* Century, and the oldest writer, that mentions it, is *Chrysostom*, in the end of the *fourth*; so that if there were liturgies in the days of *Chrysostom*, that is enough. Now, that there were liturgies in his time, (composed indeed, or chosen by the pastor

pastor himself, not imposed on him by others) Mr. Peirce, to whom you refer on this head, expressly grants, *Vindict. of Dissent.* Part II. p. 135. saying, that they were in use in the year 397. beyond which year Chrysostom lived, and that 'tis not unlikely, that Chrysostom himself used a form.

The contempt with which you treat the *Arabic* version in the Polyglot, the *Coptic*, and the *Saxon*, upon the account of your supposing them made from, or corrected by the *Latin* MSS. and your treating the *Latin* fathers with disdain, as not fit to decide in this dispute, is prodigiously unaccountable in you, who, from the testimonies of *these very Latin fathers*, and *these very same Latin MSS.* defend the genuineness of that contested passage, in 1 *John* v. 7, 8. which is not found in any *Greek MS.* now in the world, older than printing, except one in *Ireland*, written since the end of the *seventh* Century, nor in any *Greek father*, besides *Manuel Cakocas*, of the fourteenth; for the *Lateran* council was *Latin*. In this case, you *expol* the *Latin* MSS. and fathers, where you want their help. But, Oh! the force of bigotry and zeal, which has now led you as eagerly to condemn them! I beseech you, be a little more consistent with your self, for your own reputation's sake.

You next set your self to examine my eighth Discourse, about the ten commands, p. 59. And here you have excessively out-done your self, and transgress'd the most distant bounds of decency, truth, and Christianity. I easily despise the apparent malice of a most tedious and wordy discourse; the whole of which will be easily answer'd and obviated. Your profess'd design is to persuade your readers, that I have written things *dangerous to morality*. I thank my good God, I know I have not; and men of the greatest sense, penetration and virtue assure me, 'tis plain I have not. In the beginning of my Discourse on the Ten Commandments, I fully guarded against any misinterpretations of my design. I said, "I readily grant, that Christians are obliged to perform most of the duties which are required, and to abstain from most of the things that are forbidden in the Ten Commandments. But, I apprehend, we are bound hereto by the law of nature, and by the law of Christ, not by any authority of the law of Moses." You say, *This passage looks friendly enough to some sins, and the omission of some duties*

ties whatever they be. Since you pretend not to know what they are, I will tell you. Those duties which were required of the *Jews* in the Ten Commands, which we are not obliged to perform, are *resting from labour on a Saturday, keeping holy the Saturday, obliging servants and cattle to rest from their labours on a Saturday*. Those things which are forbidden the *Jews*, in the Ten Commandments, which Christians may practice, are *working upon a Saturday, employing servants and cattle on a Saturday*. Ceremonial sins and duties were the *only ones* I excepted. That I did not except *moral* sins and duties, is plain, from what I said, p. 153. "The *Mosaic* law contain'd precepts of different kinds; some related to *positive* institutions, and ceremonies of religion; others required *moral* duties. Both these sorts of precepts [in the *Mosaic* law] obliged the *Jews*; but neither of them oblige us. The same God, who required these *moral* duties of the *Jews*, has required (as strictly, and under more awful sanctions) the *same moral* duties of us. But we are not obliged to perform these duties of morality, because God required the *Jews* to perform them, but because he has particularly required us, by reason, and by the gospel, to perform the same." This passage fully explains my meaning to every one that understands *English*. And this easily shews, that I have not talk'd any inconsistent things in that Discourse. You have thrown together many of my expressions in your *Preservative*, p. 61, 62, 63. which you have, after your leader, an odd fancy to represent, as declaring, that *moral precepts are abolish'd*. Surely, Sir, your head, or your heart, is very oddly turn'd, or else you would not have been capable of arguing, that, if we are not obliged by the Ten Commands, we are not obliged by any divine Commands at all; or that, if God did not speak to us in the Ten Commands, it will follow, that he does not speak to us in the gospel neither. If you will not stand to this foolish shadow of the appearance of reasoning, you must own, that, after all I have said about our not being obliged to obey the Ten Commands, I do still consistently maintain, that we are, both by the eternal and unalterable law of nature, and by the holy and everlasting gospel of Christ, obliged to practice every *moral* virtue whatsoever, which was required of the *Jews* in the
Ten

Ten Commands, and to abstain from every *moral* evil, without exception, which was forbidden to the *Jews*, in the Ten Commands. And that you could not *mistake* my meaning, though you have actually *misrepresented* it, I shall shew the reader, by transcribing some passages, which, no doubt, you read in my two letters to Mr. *Vowler*, and a letter which I sent to you long enough before your *Preservative* was publish'd, and perhaps before it was sent to the press. In my first letter to Mr. *Vowler*, I said, " By the law of nature, God speaks " to all mankind, and binds them to moral virtue: By " the Ten Commandments, and the rest of the *Mosaic* " law, God spoke to the *Israelites*, who were brought " up out of the land of *Egypt*, and bound them to " morality. By the Commands in the gospel, God speaks " to us, and binds us to the *same moral* virtues, as he " required of the *Jews* in the Ten Commandments, " and to all others too.—I always did, and still do, " seriously believe, that we are obliged, by the gospel, " to obey *every* precept of the *moral* law, and particu- " larly to have no other gods but one; not to wor- " ship images, not to take the name of the Lord in " vain, to keep holy the Lord's day, instead of the " *Jewish* sabbath, to honour our parents, not to murder, " not to commit adultery, not to steal, not to bear false " witness against our neighbour, not to covet our neigh- " bour's house, wife, servant, or any thing that is his." You now represent me as talking *inconsistently*, when I say, we are not bound by the law of *Moses*, but by the gospel of Christ; and yet you knew I had said, in my second letter to Mr. *Vowler*, " I am not sensible that I " have contradicted my self, in my Discourse on the Ten " Commandments. If I could find any expressions of " mine therein, that have the least tendency to licen- " tiousness, I would immediately recant them, and as " heartily condemn them as you. My real thoughts, " without the least disguise about morality, and the Ten " Commandments, are these: In the Ten Commands " God spoke to the *Jews*; in the gospel, God says " *all the same* things to us, excepting only, that, in- " stead of the *Saturday*, he has order'd us to keep " holy the Lord's day." Besides these full and strong declarations, and expositions of my meaning, you had some others, in a private letter which I wrote to you
in

in last *August*, which, I know, you received, and read, though you never thought fit to answer it. I choose to lay that whole letter before the world, that it may judge (though you know not) *what a spirit you are of*. The letter was in the following words :

To the Reverend Mr. Enty, in Exeter.

Reverend Sir,

YOU have thought fit, in two pulpits, to raise the passions of many people against me, and to give them occasion to think, that I have endeavour'd to set aside the moral law of God ; at least, some of your hearers thought you designed thus to represent me. I cannot but complain of this, as an injury done to my reputation, in the tenderest point. From you I must seek satisfaction. In order to make me satisfaction, I insist upon it, that, the next Lord's day, you read my own words, as they lie in my eighth Discourse, particularly the following passages, that the people may be able to judge for themselves, whether I am against the moral law of God, or not.

" The same God, who required these moral duties
" of the *Jews*, has required (*as strictly, and under more*
" *awful* sanctions) the same moral duties of us, p. 153.
" and, by the rules of the gospel, we are bound under
" the most awful sanctions of eternal life or misery,
" p. 177. and we are, by the law of the gospel, obliged
" to avoid the same sins of idolatry, perjury, murder, a-
" dultery, theft, &c. as were forbidden to the *Jews* in
" the Ten Commandments." p. 166.

I now assure you, that, by *idolatry*, I meant the same sins as were forbidden in the first and second Commandments, *viz.* both the having more Gods than one, and the worshiping God by images ; that by *perjury*, I meant the sin that is forbidden the *Jews* in the third Command ; and that in the &c. I included the sins forbidden in the ninth and tenth Commands, *viz.* bearing false witness and coveting.

And, if you shall think fit to say any thing, in the pulpit, about my opinion relating to the Lord's day, I demand it, as a piece of justice, that you, at the same

time, recite the following paragraph from my book,
p. 172, viz.

" Instead of observing the Sabbath, we, Christians,
" are obliged to observe the Lord's day, (which is very
" improperly called, *The Sabbath*, by some Christians)
" the day on which our blessed Savior rose from the dead,
" which is called, by the apostle, *The Lord's day*, to
" distinguish it from the other days of the week ; signi-
" fying, that we must distinguish it from them, by de-
" sisting from our worldly labours, and by spending it in
" the service, and to the honour of the Lord." If you will
fairly recite these sentences of my book, I cannot oppose
your reading any others therein that relate to the Ten
Commandments.

And whereas you have been pleased to say, that
Mr. *Baxter* has not taught the same doctrine as I have,
I claim it, as a piece of justice, that you read, in the
same pulpits, the following words of his Annotations, on
2 Cor. iii. viz. *Paul* affirmeth, " That the very law,
" written in stone, is abolish'd, and done away.——
" We are bound to the law, commonly called moral,
" as it is the law of nature and of Christ, but not formally,
" as the law given the *Jews*, by *Moses*, or as written in
" stone." And then I cannot be against your repeating
any other passages of his books whatsoever. Pray, let
the people judge, with their own understandings, whe-
ther Mr. *Baxter* has said the same as I have, or not.
You will do me justice if you will add, that " I se-
" riously declare, I meant no more than what the said
" words of Mr. *Baxter*, here above recited, do plainly
" and necessarily mean. If any of my expressions were
" capable of meaning more, I would heartily retract
" them. I had no thoughts of declaring against morality,
" being most assuredly persuaded, that God has obliged
" all mankind thereto *by the law of nature*, and all that
" hear the gospel by the strictest rules, and most awful
" sanctions of it. We are obliged to all the precepts of
" the moral law, as coming to us from the mouths of
" Christ, and of his apostles."

If you shall please to take notice of these things
in the pulpits, you will do me justice ; but, with-
out this, it is impossible for you to repair the vast
injury you have done to my reputation. If you will
not

not do me this justice, I must do my self justice, as well as I can, and shall particularly be forced to print this letter, of which I keep an attested copy.

I conclude with assuring you, that I have so much regard to morality, and to the Christian religion, as heartily to pray God to give great and eminent success to all your sincere indeavours to promote obedience to the moral law, and the faith of the gospel of Christ; and that I am very ready to testify, upon every fit occasion, that

I am

Exon, Aug.

Your humble servant,

22, 1729.

J. Hallet, jun.

I could never hear that, in the pulpit, you did me the justice that I have desired, and therefore have publish'd this letter.

After this letter, it was wickedness in you to represent me, as you continually do for above sixty pages together, as opposing morality and virtue; though, in the fore-mention'd letters, both to Mr. Vowler and to your self, I most expressly declared my belief, that God, in the gospel, has obliged us, Christians, to keep holy the Lord's day, and to have no more gods than one, yet you insinuate still, that I am against these things. Your words are, p. 64. "If Mr. H——t had a more particular pique against some of the Commandments, as the fourth, which he mentions, and the first, which he does not,——why had he not struck out these only?" This is direct falsification; for if you was so ignorant as not to know, without my telling you, that *idolatry* signifies the sins forbidden in both the first and second Commandments, yet, after I had expressly told you, that, by *idolatry*, I meant *the having more gods than one*, as well as the worshiping God by images, it must be down-right scandal and slander, to represent me as having a pique against the first Commandment; nay, I do not think that any part of scripture, more directly and demonstrably, over-turns your doctrine, than the doctrine of the first Commandment does. It says, *Thou shalt have no other gods before ME*. Pray, Sir, mind that word, *ME*. It, undoubtedly, signifies but one single Be-

ing, but one single Spirit : whereas you are known to hold the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are three Spirits ; so that the first Commandment could not have served your purpose, unless it had been express'd thus, *Thou shalt have no other gods before U.S.*

You tell us, in your *Defense of the Assembly*, p. 57. that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have " the same " glorious perfections, do the same works, and act in " the most perfect harmony ; " and 'tis common with you to say, they act in concert : which can admit of no sense, if they are not three Spirits, having three understandings, and three wills ; and I have been assured, by one, who has talk'd much with you on this head, that this is your opinion. Upon this, I cannot but observe, that your opinion is, strictly speaking, infinitely different from that of, at least, the majority of the assembly. They believe, that the one God is one single Spirit, and so deny the existence of two of those infinite Spirits, in which you believe. As then, in your opinion, an *Atheist* is one, who denies the existence of all three infinite Spirits, so your brethren, who deny the existence of two of them, must, in your opinion, have *two thirds* of the guilt of Atheism in them, *i. e.* their Atheism is to their faith, as *two to one* ; and so they cannot be in the way to salvation. You cannot think it sufficient to believe in *one* infinite Spirit ; because, if the existence of *three* be, in nature, necessary, the belief of the existence of every one of them, must, in the nature of things, be as necessary, as the belief of the existence of any one of them. But while your notion thus necessarily condemns the majority, at least, of your brethren, they cannot help looking upon you, as one that believes in, and worships *three gods*, and as acting directly against the letter of the first Command, *Thou shalt have no other gods before ME*, one single Being, or Spirit, not three that act in concert.

Your comparing me with *Simon Magus*, the author of the *Fable of the Bees*, &c. in p. 65, 66, 67. is wilful calumny, after you had read my letters to Mr. Vowler and your self.

You know it to be false, tho' you say it, p. 68. that I attempt to *raise the Ten Commandments out of the Bible*. Saying, that a law does not oblige gentile Christians, is not raising it out of the Bible. It must remain there

there still, as *all* the laws of *Moses* do. In the same page, you as wickedly say, I *attempt to over-turn all natural religion*; when you are sensible I have expressly declared, that, *by the law of nature, God speaks to all mankind, and binds them to moral virtue*. And, though I have proved that nature, alone, without a revelation, cannot discover a future state of rewards and punishments, in another world, yet the law of nature still subsists of eternal and unalterable obligation, and has sanctions added to it by God also.

You most impertinently go about to prove, p. 69, &c. what I have not so much as *seem'd* to deny, that moral laws are more excellent than ceremonial. I have said, that though God has not given us the same ceremonial laws as he gave the *Jews*, yet he has given us *all the same moral laws*, in the gospel, as he gave the *Jews*, in the xxth of *Exodus*, and in any other part of the law of *Moses*.

After all the furious noise you have made about this matter, (to your own discredit among men of sense, I assure you, more than mine) if you understand your self, you do not differ from me. I am ashamed to think I should be forced into such a dispute about words.

You say, p. 104. "The Ten Commandments were all in force before *Moses's* time, and can't but be in force as long as there is any religion in the world that is worthy of God." When you say, the Ten Commandments were in force *before Moses his time*, I think you do not express your meaning well. I should choose to say, that the law of nature (which is what I always mean by *the moral law*) was in being *before Moses his time*; or, in other words, that by the law of nature God required of all men, before *Moses*, as well as all men else, those moral virtues, which he particularly required of the *Jews* in the Ten Commandments. This is the very thing that you say, in what I take to be more accurate expressions. By what were men obliged to morality before the time of *Moses*? They could not be obliged, by that particular set of laws, that were not publish'd then. They could not be obliged by the Ten Commands, before the Ten Commands were in being; but, at that time, they were obliged by the law of

of nature. Thus, though God does not speak to Christians in the law of *Moses*, that is no argument that he does not speak to us at all. He speaks to us both by the eternal law of nature, and by the blessed gospel of Christ. You have said this very same thing in such words as I have chosen, p. 116. *The moral duties, required by both [law and gospel] are the same.* Nay, you have gone farther yet, and given up the whole of the dispute to me, p. 90. where you speak of a law that *was intended to oblige the Ephesians, and in them (as Dr. Towerfon speaks) because they were Gentiles, all other Christians.* Here, when you had a guide, you spoke right. A moral law, viz. *Children obey your parents*, was intended to oblige the *Ephesians*. A question is moved, whether this law obliges all other Christians? Mr. *Enty* well answers, *Yes.* It is next ask'd, how shall we know that a law, intended to oblige them, was intended to oblige us? Mr. *Enty* does not say, because it was a moral law, but because the *Ephesians were Gentiles*; which is as much as to say, if the *Ephesians* had been *Jews*, it could not have been known *merely* from its having been given to them, that a moral law given to them was designed to oblige the *Gentiles*. This must have been known, not from the law's being given to them, but from the law of nature, which is given to all men, and from the gospel, which is designed for all men. In this passage, you have yielded all that I have contended for on this head. And now I leave you to consider, and repent of your abusive invectives, and malicious harangues, the like to which I never read before. Your heinous wickedness has thrown me into a grave temper; but you soon provoke me to laugh again.

You tell us, very merrily, p. 73. that "A seventh part of time, is all that the law (*i. e.* the fourth Command) requires; but whether this shall be on *Friday*, or on *Saturday*, or on that which we observe, this must be determined some other way, than by the fourth Commandment." And yet the fourth Commandment tied down the *Jews* to that very day on which God rested from his works; and so the *Jews* always did, and do, understand it. I would have you consult your reputation a little better, than by publishing

ing your Discourse about the Sabbath, to expose your self to ridicule, by advancing such things, as all the world will laugh at.

It is very true, as you say, *p. 74.* that the *Gentiles* were obliged (I add, even before *Moses* was born) to turn from idols to the true God. But this is not to the purpose of our present dispute.

You take notice, *p. 74.* that the *cercmonial* law was some way intended for the use of the *Gentiles*; for which purpose you quote *1 Cor. ix. 8, &c.* where the apostle argues he had a right to maintenance, because the law forbid the *Jews* to muzzle the mouth of the ox that treads out the corn; and adds, that this law was written for the sake of the apostles. The apostle's meaning, and arguing, makes nothing against me. He well argues, that if God was so merciful to oxen, as to make an express law in their favour, that they should be allowed to eat of the fruit of their labours, there can be no doubt but that God is so merciful to his apostles, as to expect, that they should be allowed to live of the gospel. He argues from the less to the greater; and adds, that God's intention, in giving that law to the *Jews*, was not merely, or chiefly, for the sake of oxen, but chiefly for the sake of directing men to infer from it, that he would have greater care taken of his ministers, whom he esteems, as unspeakably better than oxen.

In the same manner, the apostle, *Eph. vi. 1, 2.* quotes the fifth Commandment, to shew that his own command was agreeable to the will of God. In the other case, he argued, *a minori ad majus*; here, *a pari*.

I will not enter upon the consideration of those texts, which you urge as proofs, that the apostles thought Christians were obliged to regard the law, as written in stone. I purpose, by God's help, to explain them all, but without taking any notice of you, in my second Volume of Notes and Discourses.

P. 75. You deliver a direct falsehood. Your words are, "The apostle was of opinion, (though Mr. H——t be not) that *what was written afore time, was written for our learning, &c.*" I am sorry you have forced me to say, that you knew this to be false when you wrote it; because, *p. 122.* you your self have transcribed some passages of my book, wherein I say, that the
Old

Old Testament is of use to Christians, to teach them God's attributes, providence, predictions, &c. And as you knew, I recommended, and constantly teach, Mr. Peirce's Catechism, you could not but know, if you have read it, that I maintain, ~~that all scripture~~, of the Old Testament, *is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnish'd to all good works, and is able to make men wise to salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus.* Now I am upon this head, I will take notice of what you, with all your zeal for morality, may take to be justifiable, but I am forced to call by its proper name, a gross forgery, viz. your forging a passage as mine, which I never said, and which I heartily detest. You print the following passage as my words, mark'd as such in the margin, "The Old Testament is of no other use, to Christians, than that they may here read the descriptions of God's attributes, the histories of his providence, the prophecies, the examples of piety, and the accounts of God's judgments on sinners." Whereas I never said, and I never thought, that the Old Testament was of no other use. All I said was, (p. 177. of my book) that the Old Testament was of use for these ends. I did not say, it was of no other use. It was not to my purpose to reckon up all the uses it serves for, in my Exposition of the fifth answer of Mr. Peirce's Catechism. There I only mention'd a few for a Specimen. The rest I reckon'd up in my Exposition on the fourth answer, which directly treats of the usefulness of the Old Testament, being the text just now quoted, *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable, &c.* When, upon this fourth answer, I had treated particularly on this head, it would have been needless to have repeated all those particulars under the next answer. And, as it happens, in the place you quote, I was so far from using the words, which you have forged as mine, that I have expressly said the contrary; for, after the several uses above-mention'd, that the Old Testament serves for, I expressly added, in the very next sentence, that *the understanding of the Old Testament, is a help to the understanding of the new*; whereas you had the courage to tell the world, that

that I said, it served for no other use than the former. After such a glaring instance of down-right forgery, I shall not be able to take your word for any thing whatsoever.

You tell us, p. 78. concerning that great Command of all religion, natural and reveled, *Thou shalt love God with all thy heart*, that it is not expressly contain'd in the ten Commands. You should have added, that this Command is more general than those, and, by necessary consequence, requires many duties, which are not at all mention'd in them.

You say, a little odly, p. 79. though the third Command only expressly forbids perjury, yet our Savior assures us, that swearing in our common conversation is forbidden thereby. Let the reader consider our blessed Savior's own words, and then judge. *Matt. v. 33, 34. It hath been said to them (as it is in the Greek) of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself; but I say unto you, Swear not at all.* Other people would think, that the words, *I say to you*, signify, that Christ here gives a new Command of his own. But you will have them to signify, *It is not I that say it, but the law says it.*

In your malicious way of charging me, you say, p. 81. *According to Mr. H——t, the moral law seems to be of no higher account than that ceremonial one, Thou shalt not seeth a kid in his mother's milk, p. 159.* whereas I expressly call'd the Command to love God with all the heart, *The greatest of all the Commandments*, p. 157. So that all your Discourse to prove, what I have asserted, that morality is better than ceremonies, is impertinent. And I cannot but charge it upon you, after this, as a direct, known, wilful falshood, to say, *God owns, though Mr. H——t is not, that moral laws were of higher account with him, than ceremonial laws, p. 82.*

You ask, p. 84. *How daring is it to tell what God would have done, or not have done, when he himself hath told us no such thing?* Though, by this question, you would insinuate that I have done this, yet it is plain I have not. The reason why I said, God desisted from speaking any more of his Commands from heaven, with a voice of majesty and terror, at the people's desire, was because I thought, I still do think, that God himself hath told us this very thing,

thing, as I proved in my *Notes and Discourses*, p. 156, 157. The texts I there urged are plain, and you have not attempted to answer them. It is plain, from *Exod.* xx. 18, &c. that the people complain'd of the great terror, and that God promised, for the time to come, to speak to them by *Moses*, immediately upon his having pronounced the Commands, before they were written upon the tables. The ten Commandments were deliver'd, *Exod.* xx. 1—17. then immediately, *ver.* 18, &c. it is said, that the people desired that God would not speak, with his own voice, to them any more: Then, in compliance with the peoples desires, God orders *Moses* to set the rest of the law before them, contain'd in the three following *Chapters*: (among which are moral precepts, as well as ceremonial, *Exod.* xxi. 12. xxii. 22. and many others, some not mentioned among the ten.) After all this, God calls up *Moses* into the mount, and then first mentions the tables of stone, *Chap.* xxiv. 12. In this history, you have events placed in their exact order, as they happen'd. And here it is express, that the two tables were not mention'd till after the request of the people; which shews, that in *Deut.* v. 22. where there is a repetition of the history, the mentioning the Tables immediately at the end of the ten Commandments, does not imply, that the tables were spoken of, and deliver'd to *Moses*, immediately after God had ended speaking to the people. To be sure, *Moses* does not contradict himself. In the repetition of the history, he chose to end one matter before he begun another; and, for that reason, did not set things in the exact order in which they happen'd; which is a method taken by all historians. You have unhappily argued against me, from *Deut.* v. where the exact order is not observed; while you took no notice of *Exodus* xx—xxiv. where the order is kept; with which you cannot possibly reconcile what you say. What you call a bold fiction of my own fancy, is really the account of facts, which *Moses* himself has given us in the book of *Exodus*, and therefore the truth.

What you have said, in thirty four pages together, concerning the several arguments I offer'd to prove, that the ten Commandments do not (though the gospel does) oblige Christians, is intirely wide of the purpose. You say many things that are very true; but they are here
impe-

impertinent. You prove, that we are obliged by the *moral law* of God ; which I never denied. All I attempted to prove was, that God gave the moral law to all men by nature, to the *Jews* in the ten, and the other moral Commands of the law of *Moses*, and to Christians in the gospel, that God speaks to us by the law of nature, and by the gospel ; not by the law of *Moses* ; that God has required all morality of us by two laws, not by three.

I have no manner of occasion to vindicate my nine arguments, because you have perfectly mistaken the *design* of them. And I have the less need to do it, because it is already done to my hands, by the great and judicious Mr. *Baxter*, in his excellent Discourse of the Lord's day, p. 74—79. and again, 188—194. in which places he fully answers your cavils. Particularly he shews, that St. *Paul*, 2 Cor. iii. 11. says, not as you would have it, that the *veil* is done away, but that the *law* is done away, p. 76. and that when Christ said, he *came not to destroy the law*, he spoke of the *whole body of God's law then in force to the Jews, consider'd as one frame, consisting of natural and positive parts*, p. 189. And, now I have mention'd Mr. *Baxter*, I will cite two or three passages more from him, which shew, that he said the very same as I have done. He says, in his book of the Lord's day, p. 74. "*Moses* his law never bound any to it but the *Jews* and *Profelytes*.——" "The decalogue was but part of the *Jewish* law, if you consider it not as it is written in nature, but in tables of stone.——Therefore it needed not any abrogation to the *Gentiles*, but a declaration that it did not bind them. The whole law of *Moses*, formally as such, is ceased, or ~~was~~ abrogated by Christ: "I say, *as such*, because materially the same things that are in that law, may be the matter of the law of nature, and of the law of Christ." I have never said any thing more than this. Give me leave, for your use, since you are very backward to take my meaning, to express Mr. *Baxter's* and my own thoughts in one manner more, which, I hope, will satisfy you. Since, in the law of *Moses* in general, and in the ten Commands in particular, there are, according to us, mingled together moral and ceremonial Commands, we cannot know what God's will is, concerning *Christians*, from

the law of *Moses*. No precept obliges us, *because* it is written in that law. How shall we know then what God requires of us? 'Tis not enough to say, he required this of the *Jews*; since he required ceremonies of them, as well as morality. If the precept is of a moral nature, how do we know it to be so? We do not infer 'tis moral, because it is in the ten Commands; since, we think, there is something ceremonial, or positive in the fourth. But we infer, that the first Commandment, for instance, is of a moral nature, because the moral law, or the eternal and unalterable law of nature, has forbidden the same thing; so that our obligation to avoid this idolatry, arises from the law of nature, (as also from the gospel) not from the law of *Moses*.

P. 108. You shew your superior skill in criticism, by saying, 'Tis a blunder to refer to *Terence*, a Latin author, to understand the just signification of a Greek word; that is to say, though *Terence* understood Greek as well as Latin, and translated much of his comedies from Greek, yet he could not tell the just signification of the Greek word *Pædagogue*, which also, in the days of *Terence*, was adopted into the Latin language. If others will laugh at this, I can only pity you, but I cannot help it.

I had said, that a *Pædagogue* was a servant, who led children to school; but it is true also, that he taught them some little things at home, to fit them the better for the school; which is the reason why *St. Paul* uses the word *Pædagogue*, for an instructor, 1 Cor. iv. 15.

You say, p. 117. that "God gave the *Jews* only the "decalogue, or moral law, till they had made the molten "calf;" whereas, if you will read *Exod.* xx—xxiv. to which I above refer'd, you will see, that, immediately after God had given the ten Commands, he added many ceremonial laws, as about an *Altar* and *Sacrifices*, Chap. xx. 24, 25, 26. before the tables were given, Chap. xxiv. 12. and so before the making of the molten calf. But because, *Dr. Whitby* told you, the fathers were unanimously of the former opinion, you was resolved to be of it too; but I rather choose to take God's own word by *Moses*.

P. 118, 119. You, without the least occasion given, say the vilest things of *Mr. Peirce*. In perfect consistence with himself, that truly good man inserted the ten Com-

Commandments into his Catechism, as Mr. *Baxter* also did into his, though both believed, in Mr. *Baxter's* phrase, *the cessation of the decalogue, as it was Moses his law*, (on the Lord's day, p. 75, 76.) For Mr. *Peirce* has express'd the questions in his Catechism, relating to the ten Commandments, in that manner, as perfectly agrees with his notion. He does not ask, *Doth the decalogue bind Christians, or what is the first Command, &c.* But he constantly proceeds thus, *viz. What WAS the first of the ten Commandments in the law? Have we any the like rule in the New Testament? What WAS the second Commandment? Have you any the like Command in the New Testament?* In this manner he uniformly goes through them all. He took this method for this very reason, that no one should suspect him to differ from Mr. *Baxter* on this head. Here was all the caution that was needful; and I dare say, that no man, who has not a determin'd malice against Mr. *Peirce*, will suspect that here is the least appearance of insincerity. No, Mr. *Enty*, if Mr. *Peirce* would have been insincere, he had not acted the part he did, but would have subscribed against his persuasion, and have continued to out-shine you, and to have been the object of your envy, *in the Assembly*. You often accuse me of *vanity*; but I shall only say, I would humbly beg leave to advise you not to think of attempting to *equal* Mr. *Peirce* as a learned writer, (which, 'tis said, you have *threaten'd* to do) because the world is already so prejudiced in Mr. *Peirce's* favour, and withal so ill-natured, that they will set his learned writings at an immense distance above all you shall be able to publish. Your collecting together what learned men have already written, will be only an evidence that you can read and transcribe, which is no more than your clark can do. If you would shine in the learned world, like him, you must *learn* the art of reasoning, the mathematicks, the *Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac*, and *Arabic* languages; you must study the scriptures, (which, alas! few divines have hitherto done) and then make and publish such vast, important, numerous, and surprizing discoveries, as he did. What a pleasure it would be to Mr. *Enty* to hear the most ingenious and most learned men in the kingdom say of Mr. *Enty*, as they actually have said of Mr. *Peirce*,
upon

upon the account of his very learned writings: *He has equal'd, and even exceeded the greatest of Commentators, Mr. Locke, and deserved to be made archbishop of Canterbury!* But if, after all my humble and friendly admonitions, you will resolve to publish, I beg you will not pretend to publish any Commentaries on the scripture, because a very learned and ingenious man, who was often forced to hear you, told me, he never heard you interpret scripture otherwise than your old grandmother would have done, from the English translation. I should not have mention'd these things, had not your rude insults on my ever memorable and worthy friend, Mr. Peirce, made it necessary.

You next proceed to speak of the specimen of my Catechism, p. 121. which I am not afraid to leave to speak for it self. You directly, and wilfully falsify, when you tell the world, p. 123. that I say, *Christians have no concern with the laws, promises, and threatnings of the Old Testament.* I had used the word *Testament*, instead of *Covenant*, but had expressly assured you, in my second letter to Mr. Fowler, that "By the commands
" and promises, which, I said, were peculiar to the *Jews*,
" I only meant those that were given them, in the law
" of Moses; being still persuaded, as I have always
" zealously maintain'd, that we, Christians, are interested
" in the covenant made with *Abraham* four hundred
" and thirty years before the law, as the apostle taught,
" *Gal. iii. 17.* as you may see in my book, p. 34. I
" have a right to interpret my own expressions; and, af-
" ter I have assured you, that I spoke only of the covenant
" made with the *Jews*, as a peculiar people, I hope you
" will not charge any other meaning upon me." Yet, directly contrary to the plainest rules of morality, you have afresh charged upon me the meaning, which, I assured you, I never had. I leave your brethren to condemn you for this, and the other instances of your *falsehood* and *forgery*.

You go on to shew, that the promises, or predictions of a Messiah, in the Old Testament, concern Christians; as if I had denied it, when you knew I had expressly said, the Old Testament is of use to us, that we may therein read the *Prophecies*; and you your self quote this very expression of mine but two Pages before, viz. 122. And then you very needlessly urge upon me, *Gal. iii. 6, &c.* which text I had my self before urged,

to

to prove the very same thing, that you would pretend to teach me to infer from it.

You go on in your old way of impertinence and falsehood, p. 128. where you say, I have cast unbecoming reflections on St. Paul, and add, that *there is nothing in his epistles but what is highly useful*. My comfort is, I have not hinted the contrary. All I said was, after St. Peter, that, in St. Paul's epistles, there are *some things hard to be understood*, and that the understanding of those things, which are hard to be understood, was not *necessary to salvation*. If you think otherwise, I would not take the pains to endeavour to persuade you out of it, because I am sensible my labour on *such* a man must be in vain.

The character you give of Mr. Peirce's Scripture-Catechism, p. 130. viz. *That it is calculated rather for the benefit of the memory, than to inform the judgment*, is not intelligible to me; for I thought, the *scriptures* were fully as well adapted to *inform the judgment*, as any writings of men. I assure you, I would not say the contrary for the world. You say, persons are still left *in the dark*, by that Catechism, *what repentance is*, because all that is there said about it is, *That men should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance*. But every one else sees, that this is a just definition of repentance; and, as it happens, the Assembly's Catechism has given the very same definition of it, in their answer, which, however, you applaud above Mr. Peirce's, though it be scripture. They call it, a *turning from sin to God with full purpose of, and endeavours after new obedience*; which obedience is the same as *works meet for repentance*. The Assembly, indeed, adds, the springs of and motives to repentance, viz. *a sense of sin*, and an *apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ*, which are also mention'd in their proper place, in Mr. Peirce's Catechism, p. 12. where are quoted Eph. i. 7. Heb. x. 19, &c. and, p. 19. where are quoted Heb. vii. 25. and iv. 14, 15. and xiii. 15. *Hatred of, and grief for sin* are plainly enough taught, p. 21. from 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, 9. and in p. 29. from 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Gal. v. 19, 20, 21, Rev. xxi. 8. And I must tell you, Sir, that the *many rays of divine light*, (which you speak of) that are scatter'd in the scriptures, and in Mr. Peirce's Catechism, are collected, even as you your self would wish, in my
Expo-

Exposition of the answer about repentance : which work Mr. Peirce designedly left to the Catechist.

You are very unhappy as to the charge of *omissions*, which you advance against this Catechism, p. 132. If you know of any text, that speaks more expressly of a *covenant* made with man in his state of *innocence*, than Gen. i. 27. *God created man in his own image*, you will oblige the world, by directing them to it. 'Tis as ridiculous for you to say, that this Catechism takes no notice of the *Covenant* made with man in his *fallen* state, when it expressly mentions Christ the Mediator, the conditions of the covenant, faith, repentance, and new obedience ; and the promises of pardon, justification, the Spirit, a blessed resurrection, eternal life, &c. as it is for the *Antinomians* to say, *You do not preach Christ*, when you preach his laws, or threats. As this Catechism was designed to be truly *Catholic*, it would have been odd to have form'd it upon the *Calvinistical* scheme, as you, of late, seem to think a Catechism should be. And the *learned* world would have thought very oddly of Mr. Peirce, if, according to your desire, he should have proved Original Sin from those words of the apostle, *We were by nature children of wrath*, which have no reference at all to that matter. You farther blame the Catechism for not containing that text, *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God* ; whereas all that you would infer from it, is taught, p. 17. by God's *saving us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost* ; and, p. 21. by Christ's *taking vengeance on them that obey not the gospel*. As for our *unhappy* condition by *nature*, which makes a *Redeemer necessary*, the Catechism is express. It expressly asks, p. 7. "What was the condition of men, that needed the help of a Mediator ?" Answ. *All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.*" Though these things are thus mention'd in Mr. Peirce's Catechism, yet you say they are *pass'd over in silence* ; and you add, "You fear 'tis with a design to throw a veil over our great obligations to our blessed Savior, who came to rescue us from our deplorable circumstances ;" (which thing, however, the Catechism also says) and I add, who will come with ten thousand of his holy angels to punish the malicious and false accusers.

You next blame the Catechism for attempting to rob our Savior, and Sanctifier, of their highest glory, and

" for

for allowing none but the Father to be the one God.²² The truth is, the Catechism has this text, *To us there is but one God, the Father*, in the third Page, to which you refer. I hope there is no heresy in that text. And I can assure you, Sir, that if Mr. Peirce had found any text in his Bible, which said, *To us there is but one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, he would have put it into his Catechism. He has actually inserted, *John i. i. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*, p. 7. And he would have added a text in which the Holy Ghost is call'd God, if he had thought there was any one such in the Bible.

Your next charge is the most extraordinary of all, p. 133. where you say, *this Catechism says nothing about the worship of Christ*; and then, after a little cant, you say it is the duty of every Christian to *honour the Son as they do the Father*. The reader will be astonish'd; when he shall be told; that there is one *whole Page* of the Catechism about this very head of the *worshipping Christ*; and particularly this very text you here recommend is cited on the occasion, *All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*. The first question, p. 34. is, *Is Christ to be worshiped?* The answer is, *Heb. i. 6. Let all the angels worship him*. The second question is, *Upon what is this Command founded?* The answer is, *Ver. 4. He hath inherited a more excellent name than they*. The third question is, *Upon what ground are men to give honour to Christ?* Answ. *John v. 22, 23. The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. Phil. ii. 8, 9, 10, 11. He humbled himself—unto death;—wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name,—that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord*. The fourth question is, *Does this honour terminate ultimately in Christ?* The answer is, *Phil. ii. 11. Every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*. These last words seem to have dazzled your eyes so much, that you could see nothing in the Page about the worshipping of Christ; though the whole Page is spent about that, and nothing else. Your advancing such very false accusations, which are so easily confuted as these, have, by the ill example you give, a ten thousand times worse

tendency to promote immorality, and to encourage lying and false witness in particular, than any thing I have said about the ten Commandments. And, to prevent the ill effects of this your very ill example, I would not have mention'd it to the world, were it not absolutely necessary to defend my own reputation, and the dear and un-sullied character of the great Mr. Peirce. If a man should, in a court of justice, accuse me of murder, when I was not guilty, all the world would allow me to prove him to be a notorious common liar, if I could, in order to my own just defense.

You next take occasion to treat largely on the head of *Worship*, p. 135, &c. in which are some things very true, and some things very weak. I shall only say a word or two on this head, which will be sufficient. We think it our duty to worship Christ in all those ways, and instances, in which the scripture has directed us to do so, either by command, or example. We give glory to him: We always baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: We constantly say, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with us all*, &c. We think it the plainest case in the world, that Christ is fully qualified to hear and answer our prayers, and to receive our thanksgivings. He fully knows all the creatures he has made, and all their actions, wants, and thoughts, all their dangers and distresses, and, indeed, every thing that can concern them. All authority is given him in heaven and earth. He has a power to bestow the blessings of God's covenant, and the things of this life, where he sees fit. In consequence of this, it cannot but be proper to ask any of these blessings of him, consider'd as the person whom his God has empower'd to bestow them, and to thank him when we have received them. The matter is as plain as the light. Christ is manifestly qualified for thus being worship'd as Mediator, and then it cannot be unfit that God should require men to worship and honour him; and so both Christ's qualifications, and God's command, will prevent all the danger of idolatry, provided we worship the Son, as Son and Mediator. But so much has been already said on this head, that has never been answer'd, that I shall add no more here, but only refer you to a pamphlet, intitled, *The Unity of God not inconsistent with the divinity of Christ*, p. 39, &c. And I the rather

ther refer you to this, because Mr. Peirce refer'd you to the same in his *Reply* to your *Truth and Liberty*, p. 29. Till you had answer'd Mr. Peirce's Reply, you should not have meddled with this subject; and till you shall have answer'd that book, I shall not meddle with your long Discourse about Christ's being equal to God, which reaches to p. 159. In that Discourse you'll find those things, which are false, confuted already. I only add, that *the true God*, 1 John v. 20. is God the Father, as is demonstrable from those words, *His Son Jesus Christ. We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding to know the true one*, (or, *the true God*, as other copies have it) *And we are in the true One*, (i. e. the true God) *through his Son*, (i. e. through the Son of the true God) *Jesus Christ. This* (i. e. this true one before mention'd, whose Son Jesus is) *is the true God*; and (it is) *eternal life to know him*, or our knowing this true one is eternal life. The text is exactly parallel to *John xvii. 3*.

I proceed to consider what you say of my Discourse about *saying grace*, p. 160. I had said, *Notes and Discourses*, p. 183. "When our Savior fed the multitude with five loaves and two fishes, it is said that *he blessed them*, Luke ix. 16. St. John, in giving us the same history, has plainly told us what is meant by this word, *Bless*, in this case. He expresses it thus; *Jesus gave thanks*, John vi. 11. From which places, compared, it appears, that *blessing bread*, is the very same as *blessing or giving thanks to God for our bread*." This observation was there confirm'd by comparing other passages of the New Testament. Upon this you say, p. 160. that the word St. Luke uses, *ευλογησαι*, sometimes signifies *praying*, or *wishing well to*. What then? Has not St. John, in his parallel, shew'd us, that, in this particular place, it must signify the same, as, *He gave thanks*?

You say, St. John does not explain St. Luke, and you give a very uncouth reason, viz. "Because Christ blessed *the loaves* first, and so they were multiplied, and then gave thanks and pray'd; for our Savior could never give thanks that the loaves and fishes were multiplied, till they were really multiplied." This last observation is very true, but not to the purpose. For what Christ gave thanks for, before the miracle was wrought, was, we may suppose, for the creatures of bread and fish.

fish, &c. and for God's giving him a power to work this miracle, as he did upon another occasion, *John xi. 41.* where Christ said, *Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me,* before he perform'd the miracle of giving life to *Lazarus, Ver. 42.* According to your way of talking, Christ first pray'd God to multiply the loaves and fishes, then they were multiplied, and then Christ gave thanks; and yet, after this giving thanks, it was that Christ distributed them to the people, *John vi. 12.* I ask you then, where lay the multiplied loaves and fishes all the while Christ was giving thanks? Were they all laid in a large heap? Unless you suppose this, how can you make out what you say? I always thought, that the food was not multiplied all at once, and prepared in one great stock, but that it insensibly multiplied as it pass'd from Christ's hands into the hands of the apostles, or as it pass'd from theirs into the peoples hands, or both. If so, then the giving thanks, *St. John* mentions before the distribution of the food, was before the working of the miracle, and so was the very same action of our Lord, as *St. Luke* calls *blessing the food*; and so *St. John* explains *St. Luke*, which is what I attempted to prove. Besides these two places of scripture, I had compared some others also, which you pass over in silence, which cannot be twisted, and shew, that the giving thanks was not after the blessing, but the same thing. Surely you will not say, that the giving thanks before the breaking the bread at the Lord's Supper, *1 Cor. xi. 24.* was after his blessing it; *Mark xiv. 22.*

Your next *Pages, 162, 163, &c.* are fill'd with downright falshoods, for which God calls you heartily to repent. You say, I suggest, "That *ALL* that a minister hath to do at the Sacrament, is *ONLY* to render thanks to God for his creatures;—which is *ALL* that Mr. *H—t* thinks is incumbent upon ministers, or Christians, when they celebrate the Lord's Supper." The vindicating my own reputation, makes it necessary for me here to charge you with a forgery, which I would not revenge for the world; and, to vindicate my self, I must observe both, that I did not say this, and that I said the direct contrary. If you are recover'd out of your passion, I would leave your self to judge, whether any such inference can be drawn from my words, in which my heavenly father knows I had no such view. My words were,

were, "There is no mystery in *blessing* the bread and
 "wining at the Lord's Supper (this you allow, p. 161.)
 "What men affect to call *Consecration of the Elements* ;
 "is unintelligible, and absolutely without all foundation.
 "Christ himself *bless'd them* no otherwise than by giving
 "thanks to God for his creatures." But in this I have
 not said, that Christ did nothing else but bless the crea-
 tures. No doubt he did other things. But, I say, that
 blessing the creatures signifies no more than blessing God
 for them, as is plain, from comparing the accounts of the
 institution of the Lord's Supper, in *Matthew, Mark,*
 Luke, and Paul. The two former use the word *Bless* ;
 the two latter use the words, *gave Thanks,* to explain
 it; and I was so far from even hinting that this is ALL
 we have to do at the Lord's Supper, that I expressly said,
 in the same Discourse, in the very next page, 186. "All
 "the publick *prayers* should be confined to the Lord's
 "Supper, which should be celebrated every time Chri-
 "stians meet in the church." If I had wrote a whole
 Discourse professedly about the nature of the Lord's Sup-
 per, I should have been inexcusable, if I had omitted to
 say, that we must there remember Christ, devote our
 selves to him, exercise all the graces of God's Spirit, bless
 God for Christ, for the new covenant, &c. But when I
 was writing no Discourse about it, but only, *by the way,*
 shewing the meaning of that one word, *Bless,* it would
 have been as impertinent to have spoken of these things
 in that place, as it is now in you to treat of them in this.
 It is an heinous wickedness in you to say, *Mr. H—t*
 makes a trifle of the Lord's Supper; when, I thank God,
 I have not said one single word that looks that way, and
 have no difference at all with other Protestants about the
 serious and spiritual duties we are to perform at the solemn
 times of breaking bread, and of prayer, for which men
 cannot keep up too great a reverence.

[P. 165. You indecently call the giving the Lord's
 Supper to infants, *a ridiculous custom,* though 'tis practised
 by all the Christian churches in the world, excepting the
 church of *Rome,* and those that came out of her; though
 it was undoubtedly a settled custom in the time of *Cyprian,*
 150 years after the death of *St. John;* and though no
 one has yet attempted to answer *Mr. Peirce's* excellent
 Essay on the subject.

You

You are never weary of uttering your falsehoods. I meet another gross one, p. 167. You say, "Mr. H—r" represents St. Paul as if he did not, and speaks of "Christians, as if they ought not to MENTION the name of Christ, when they perform ANY duty in the presence and company of unbelievers." You falsely say I spoke of any duty, when I spoke only of ONE duty, viz. Prayer, in the company of unbelievers. I said, since the unbelievers in the ship with St. Paul, Acts xxvii. 35. would not, and could not, join in any worship, that was to be offer'd up to God through Jesus Christ, I suppose, in that company, he said grace without mentioning the name of Christ in the prayer. I lay it down for a certain truth, that St. Paul would not speak a lie to God in his thanksgiving. But if all in the ship were unbelievers besides himself, it would have been a lie, if he had said, *We offer thanks in the name of Christ*; or, *We ask for Christ's sake*. What you add, in your invidious way about the necessity of our confessing Christ before men, is not here to the purpose, because I never denied it. St. Paul might, and no doubt did, in his Discourses, or preaching, not only own Christ, but also persuade the company to believe in him. But the apostle had not such a mean notion of Christian worship, or prayers, as to think, that they could be offer'd up in the name of unbelievers. 'Tis impossible, in the nature of things, that unbelievers and wicked men should join in Christian prayers. They cannot say, with truth, *Father, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, we ask in the name of Christ*. This is one reason why I said, that all the prayers of the church should be confined to the Lord's Supper, and that none should be admitted (as was the method in the first ages) to the prayers, but those who appear to be qualified by faith in Christ, and by an holy life, if they are grown up, for the Lord's Supper. The church will never flourish as it did in the first ages, till the Lord's Supper shall be again administer'd every Lord's day, and the solemn prayers be then offer'd up to God, when the unbelievers and sinners, who may hear sermons, are departed. I leave the world to judge, whether this be lessening mens regard to the ordinances of our holy religion. I add, though, to avoid lying to God, St. Paul did not say in the ship, *WE ask for Jesus sake*, yet 'tis natural to suppose, he inwardly, in his own mind,

added,

added, *I ask for Jesus sake*, or to that purpose. This was not *sneaking* and *time-serving*, but his absolute duty, and shews, that all your cant about missionaries is impertinent. 1 Cor. xiv. 24. does not, as you carelessly represent the text, speak of *unbelievers* being present at the prayers of the church, but merely during the exhortation, or preaching, there call'd, *Propheying*: *If all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, he is convinced.* And 'tis a plain proof, that you know nothing of the fathers, and that you *write history by invention*, when you say, p. 171. they allowed any that would to be present at their prayers.

Saying grace after meat, is no work of *Supererogation* (if you mean any ill thing by that hard word) since it is warranted by the general commands of *praying always*, and of *giving thanks in every thing*. These general commands warrant saying grace at a tea-table, and a custom, which prevails in some places, in Scotland, of saying grace when a company sit down to drink a glass of wine, or a cup of beer, between meals; and yet I do not suppose you will say, we are bound in conscience to do so. If you will make more duties than God has made, I dare not do it.

I come now to consider what you say about my Discourse of the *New Jerusalem*, which you have as wickedly misrepresented as any of the rest. The great, the known, the wilful falsehood, that runs through your whole Discourse on this head, is, that I "teach persons to carry their views and expectations no higher than an earthly paradise, and carnal and sensual delights," p. 200. Now, I say, you knew this to be false, and a wicked slander, when you wrote it, because I not only had said no such thing, but had expressly said the contrary. I said, p. 191. *They shall be completely happy, both in body and in SOUL*, and (p. 378.) *shall be fix'd in an everlasting state of perfect holiness, and of consummate bliss.* And, I hope, you do not reckon perfect holiness, and complete happiness in Soul, to be carnal and sensual delights. Besides, in my second letter to Mr. Fowler, I said, "I have not the least dispute with you about the perfect holiness, the happiness, the exercises, and the enjoyments of good men in the other world. I only inquired after the place." If I had wrote a Discourse about the enjoyments and happiness of good men in the

New

New Jerusalem, I should have particularly observed, they shall enjoy Christ, and God, be employ'd in the spiritual exercises of love, praise, &c. But I should have been impertinent, like you, if I had treated of these things in a Discourse, in which I only propos'd to speak of the place.

As to all the texts you cite, p. 178, &c. it is enough to observe, they do not contradict what St. John has said about the coming down of the *New Jerusalem* upon the new earth, because "the house, the hope, the inheritance, the substance, the treasure, the place prepared for believers, is (as I said, p. 182.) now in heaven; and "when the *New Jerusalem* comes down, these things "shall come down in and with it." If you do not understand this, I cannot help it.

For answer to p. 181. I observe, that the apostle does not say, in 2 Cor. v. 1. that the house will be eternally in the heavens, as you represent it; but there mentions two distinct characters, viz. its duration and present place, eternal in duration, and, as to place, in heaven. And then he adds, Ver. 2. that it will be (as we must supply the Greek, in which there is no note of time) our house from heaven; which is exactly parallel to St. John's saying, that the *New Jerusalem* shall come down from God out of heaven, Rev. xxi. 2, 10. If I had cited 2 Cor. v. 1, 2. I should not have omitted the word *Eternal*. What I said about the text was in these words, viz. "The house not made with hands, in which good men shall dwell, is, at present, in the heavens; but hereafter it shall be an house from heaven." This manner of referring to scripture, you ignorantly call an insufferable liberty; because you did not mind the difference between an adjective and an adverb.

I pass over your silly banter, p. 182. about what you call my glorious fine place, having gates, and walls, and porters, or centinels, &c. because all the banter falls upon St. John the apostle, who has expressly mention'd every one of the things you banter; and he is above needing my help to defend him.

Against the interpretation I gave of 2 Pet. iii. 13, it was urged to me long ago, that the promise he speaks of must be that in *Isaiah*, about the new heavens, and the new land. But I have demonstrated the contrary, to my friend's satisfaction, in a Discourse, which possibly I may hereafter publish.

You

You say, p. 189. It is Mr. H——'s *pert* and *bold* addition to Christ's words, *The kingdom of heaven*, to speak of a kingdom that will hereafter come down out of *heaven*; though these are St. John's own words. I hope it is no very *bold*, or *pert* thing to add the apostle's words to our Savior's, which I am sure can never clash.

When I ask'd, *Where can the heaven be?* I knew it was where Christ, *Enoch*, and *Elias* are, and that consequently it must be a place fit for the habitation of their, and other glorious *bodies*. They now dwell in the *New Jerusalem*; but still we know not where that particular part of infinite space is, in which it is placed. Hereafter it will be on the new earth. What I have already said, in my eleventh Discourse, to shew, that St. John, in the last *Chapters* of the *Revelation*, is, in great measure, to be understood literally, and that *for ever and ever*, is different from a *thousand years*, fully answers what you have said on these heads.

The bounds I have set my self will not permit me to expose your weakness and wickedness, as I might, in *many* more instances. I must hasten to a conclusion; and now I desire to relieve both my self and the reader with a little *mirth*.

That you might not seem to come short of the *envied* Mr. *Peirce*, in any part of knowledge, you have ventured to try your skill at *Mathematicks*, p. 194. speaking concerning the dimensions of the *New Jerusalem*, Rev. xxi. 16. You say, "If 12000 furlongs contain the *area* of the whole city, as most probably it doth; then the square of it being 109 furlongs, this city will be considerably less than *Old Babylon*, the square of which, according to *Herodotus*, was 120." Here, according to *your new Mathematicks*, 109 is the square of 12000. *i. e.* in other words, 109 is not only as much as 12000, but even 12000 times more than 12000; or, if you multiply 12000 by 12000, the product will be no more than 109. You cite *Herodotus*, I hope, without having look'd into him, for the sake of your character as a *Grecian*. For he says, *Babylon* lay four-square; each *wall* was 120 furlongs, and the *circuit*, or all the four walls together were 480 furlongs, *Lib. I. cap. 178. p. 74. Edit. Steph. 1618.* *Herodotus*, I assure you, had more sense than to say, that 120 is the *area*, or square of a city, whose compass is 480, since the square of it is really 14400. I hope you will be

cautious not to go out of your way to talk of *Mathematicks* again; which minds me of a famous doctor's *parallel lines* that meet in the center.

As *Herodotus*, in the place now cited, mentions not the number of the square-furlongs of *Babylon*, but only the length of one wall, and the circuit; so, no doubt, *St. John* does not give us the square-number, but either the square-root, i. e. the length of one wall, or else the circuit. This is confirm'd, by observing, that the number 12000 was discover'd by the measure, not by computation. If the 12000 furlongs be the length of one wall, *St. John's* city will be to *Old Babylon* as 10000 to 1. i. e. it will be ten thousand times bigger. As the compass of *Old Jerusalem* was 33 furlongs (See *Notes* and *Discourses*, p. 209.) its square must be a little more than 64. and much less than 81 furlongs. We'll suppose it to be 70; then *St. John's* city must be in area, to *Old Jerusalem*, as more than 2050000 to 1, i. e. above two million times bigger.

If the 12000 furlongs should be the compass of the whole city, or the measure of the four walls, then the square of it will be 9,000,000; and it will be in area 625 times bigger than *Old Babylon*, and above 128571 times bigger than *Old Jerusalem*.

Your mistaking thus about areas and squares, is the less surprizing to me, when I consider what egregious mistakes you were guilty of about more common words and things, in your *Sermon* on the coronation of the king and queen.

I conclude with some words of yours, in that *Sermon*, which, if you had well digested, and remember'd, you would not have run into such methods of persecution, as you have done in your *Preservative*, which is the fullest of bitterness, envy, uncharitableness, slander, falshood, and forgery, of all the books that I have ever read. Your words are, *Serm.* p. 28, &c. "I never was, never can be an advocate for a spirit [of persecution.] It is a spirit, I know, that our Popish adversaries have done their utmost to cherish and encourage, in the midst of us; as knowing, that if any thing could weaken us, this would,——This temper has often occasion'd such convulsions amongst us, that, methinks, we should be for ever sick and surfeited with this part of Popery.——I must think, that persons should be led by their own light, and guided by the direction of their own
" con-

"conscience. — It should be a pleasure to Protestants, that they are likely to have no encouragement from the throne to bite, and devour one another, and so weaken their own interest. I fear, we have been all too foolish in this matter, in our respective turns."

I am sure, Sir, you have now, in your *Preservative*, been too foolish with a witness in this matter of persecuting, with your pen, the living and the dead, and in bearing false witness against your brethren. I heartily wish you of a better temper; and am ready to shew that I can forgive a slanderer, by being, as far as I safely may,

Your humble Servant,

Edm. March

21, 1730.

JOSEPH HALLETT, jun.

ERRAT.

P. 6. l. 14. after *Light*, add, *which God has vouchsafed*
to us.

PAGE 4. l. 25. read *them*, only when. p. 6. l. 9. r. the *Representatives*. p. 8. l. 39, 40. r. as Dr. Wotton, or you, more truly than you thought of, speak. p. 9. l. 20. blot out the *c* in the Margin. l. 38. r. overturn'd in this Letter, p. 35. p. 12. l. 35. for *have*, r. *knew*. p. 14. l. 14. r. MSS. l. 18. r. *Calecas*. l. last, for *on*, r. *to*. p. 20. l. 2. r. *hold that the*. p. 24. l. 5. r. *maintain*, tho' you say, I do not, *that*. p. 25. l. 34. for *does*, r. *will*. l. last, for *and*, r. as l. p. 27. l. 33. blot out *was*. p. 31. l. 38. r. are plainly. l. 39. r. and in. p. 32. l. 7. r. *Image*, cited, p. 5. and *Rom. v. 12.* p. 8. p. 43. l. 1. r. *Consciences*.

**BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White
Hart, near Mercers-Chapel, in Cheap-side.**

I. A Free and impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures, recommended: Being Notes on some peculiar Texts, with Discourses and Observations on the following Subjects, viz. 1. Of the Quotations from the *Old Testament*, in the *Apocrypha*. 2. Of the *Septuagint* Version of the *Bible*; and the Difference between the *Citations*, as they lie in the *New Testament*, and the *Original Passages* in the *Old*. 3. *Christians* not bound by any Authority of the Law of *Moses* in the *Ten Commandments*. 4. Of the *Doxology* at the End of the Lord's Prayer: Of blessing the *Eucharistical Elements*, and of Grace before and after Meat. 5. The Son of God knows the Hearts of Men; and, of Anger, Catechising, &c. 6. A Passage in Bishop *Pearson* on the Creed; and another in Bishop *Patrick's* Commentaries examin'd. 7. Of the Soul; its Immortality, Immateriality, &c. with the Impossibility of proving a Future State by the Light of Nature; and of the Place where good Men shall dwell after the Resurrection. By *J. Hallet, jun.*

II. Index Librorum MSS. Græcorum & Versionum Antiquarum Novi Foederis quos Viri eruditissimi *J. Millius*, & *L. Kusterus*, cum tertia editione Stephanica contulerunt. Studio & Opera, *J. Hallet, jun.* Pret. 1 s.

III. The Reconciler; or, an Essay to shew, that *Christians* are much more agreed in their *Notions* concerning the *Trinity*, than has commonly been represented. Price 6 d. *Joseph Hallet, jun.*

IV. A Reply to Mr. *Enty's* Piece, intitled, Truth and Liberty consistent, &c. By the Author of the Propositions address'd to him. Price 1 s. *James Peirce*

V. Reflections on some Passages in Mr. *Peirce's* Answer to Mr. *Enty's* Truth and Liberty, &c. Price 3 d. *J. Hallet*

VI. A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of *St. Paul* to the *Colossians*, *Philippians*, and *Hebrews*; after the manner of Mr. *Locke*. To which are annex'd, Several critical Dissertations on particular Texts of Scripture.

VII. Fifteen Sermons on several Occasions; Eight of which were never before printed. To which is added, A Scripture-Catechism; or, the Principles of the Christian Religion laid down in the Words of the Bible.

These two by the late Reverend and Learned Mr. *James Peirce*, of *Eton*.

8 JU 65